

Message

---

**From:** LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]  
**Sent:** 6/7/2018 6:10:16 PM  
**To:** Fairbanks, Brianna [Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]; Butler, Thomas [Butler.Thomas@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** 2014 Tetra Tech EC Response to Alpha Scan signed by the Radiation Safety Officer that contains suspect data  
**Attachments:** TtEC Response to Alpha Scan Inquiry (4).pdf; Draft Building Data Initial Evaluation Report.pdf

Confidential - protected by attorney client privilege

Dear Brianna,

As we discussed by phone, the attached 2014 memo from Tetra Tech was signed by Erik Abkemeier, who was the Radiation Safety Officer for Tetra Tech EC Inc. at HPNS for many years. He left that job years ago and now works for Navy RASO, but he is not working on HPNS related matters. Pat Brooks and Matt Slack of the Navy described this memo verbally to the technical team 9/12/2018 at the USEPA office. City and State representatives participated in that meeting.

Please see attached Navy Draft Building data evaluation report.

On p. 20 of the pdf is Table 6 2. Summary of Duplicated Alpha and Beta Results  
The 4th row of the table references Parcel B, Bldg 113 and the footnote #3.

On p. 22 is a footnote that references this memo:

"Only these 400 ABSC ceiling results for Survey Unit 26 appear in the FSSR. The previous 250 ABSC wall results for Survey Unit 26 are not in the FSSR but were used (with the 400 ABSC ceiling results) in the TtEC-submitted paper, Technical Paper Discussing Alpha Scan Speed at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) under Basewide Radiological Removal Action, June 26, 2014."

The Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) is the report that first went out in 2010 to document the work TTEC had done in 2009 to justify the request for regulatory approval. I have a copy of that if you want, but it is too large a file to email.

The attached 2014 memo was a response to an inquiry from the Navy about the actual scan speeds appearing to be higher than the scan speeds that the workplan specified. A higher speed could have resulted in missing potential contamination. The instruments did not measure speeds in real time or track using GPS coordinates. Instead, an average speed was estimated based on taking the total amount of area scanned that was scanned (according to records) and dividing it by the amount of time it took (according to records). (Of course, these records may not be reliable.)

By adding new data in the 2014 memo that did not previously appear in the 2010 FSSR, it would give the effect of appearing to show a larger amount of area that was scanned. Therefore the average scan speed would appear to be lower and closer to compliance with the workplan.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns related to this memo.

Lily